


UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES



Ex parte WAYNE JERALD HENSHAW,
MAIL VAGANAM MAHENDRAN
and
HENRY BEHMANN

Application 09/621,234

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was received electronically at the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on April 19, 2007. A review of the application has revealed that the application is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being electronically returned to the examiner. The matters requiring attention prior to docketing are identified below:

An examination of the Image File Wrapper (IFW) reveals that an Appeal Brief was filed on April 3, 2006.

37 CFR § 41.37(c)(1) (2005) reads as follows:

(c)(1) The brief shall contain the following items under appropriate headings and in the order indicated in paragraphs (c)(1)(i) through (c)(1)(x) of this section, except that a brief filed by an appellant who is not represented by a registered practitioner need only substantially comply with paragraphs (c)(1)(i) through (c)(1)(iv) and (c)(1)(vii) through (c)(1)(x) of this section:

....

(v) *Summary of claimed subject matter.* A concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, which shall refer to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters. For each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately under the provisions of paragraph (c)(1)(vii) of this section, every means plus function and step plus function as permitted by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, must be identified and the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function must be set forth with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters.

The “Summary of claimed subject matter” appearing on pages 2 and 3 of the Appeal Brief filed April 3, 2006 is deficient because it does not map the independent claim(s) to the specification. See § 1205.03(B) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) (Eighth Edition, Rev. 3, August 2005) which states:

(B) When the Office holds the brief to be defective solely due to appellant's failure to provide a summary of the claimed subject matter as required by 37 CFR 41.37 (c)(1)(v), an entire new brief need not, and should not, be filed. Rather, a paper providing a summary of the claimed subject matter as required by 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v) will suffice. Failure to timely respond to the Office's requirement will result in dismissal of the appeal. See MPEP § 1215.04 and § 711.02(b).

Correction is required.

In addition, an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) was filed on November 23, 2004. While two of the three foreign patent documents have been considered, it is not apparent from the record whether WO 94/11094 was considered. A communication notifying appellants of the Primary Examiner's decision regarding consideration of WO 94-11094 is required.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the application is returned to the Examiner:

- 1) for notification to appellants to submit a paper providing a revised “Summary of claimed subject matter”;
- 2) for consideration of said paper;
- 3) for consideration of WO 94/11094 included in the IDS filed July 1, 2004, and written notification to appellants regarding the Primary Examiner’s decision; and
- 4) for such further action as may be appropriate.

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

By: *Patrick J. Nolan*
PATRICK J. NOLAN
Deputy Chief Appeals Administrator
(571) 272-9797

PJN:psb

Bereskin and Parr
40 King Street West
Box 401
Toronto ON M5H 3Y2
Canada